UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,402	03/18/2004	Clark E. Smith	C382.12-0180	7374
	7590 03/28/200 HAMPLIN & KELLY,	EXAMINER		
SUITE 1400	AVENUE SOUTH	FANTU, YALKEW		
	S, MN 55402-3319	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2838	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/804,402	SMITH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
YALKEW FANTU	2838		

	YALKEW FANTU	2838						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
	a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be t	iled within two month	e of the date of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core. (b) They raise the issues of new matter (con NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloge) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	•	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DT01 004					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a Ne	tice of Appeal will not	· ha antarad					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
2. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>								
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:								
	/Gary L. Laxton/							
3/26/2008	Primary Examiner Art Unit 2838							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that "... no convincing line of reasoning as to why.... to have been obvious in light of the teachings of Bertness and Tran, which include nothing about "... external device having an alarm configured to notify a user ... from the communication circuitry...". Bertness, however, discloses a "battery charger [figure 1] comprising: battery charging circuitry [figure 1 -12] configured to couple to a battery [8], and to provide a charging signal to the battery [col. 2, Ins 38-48]; and communication circuitry [80], coupled to the charging circuitry [via 34], configured to transmit a signal to an external device upon receipt of a charge status code from the battery charging circuitry [col. 5, Ins 5-17]; Tran, on the other hand, discloses that the external device (such as a telephone receiver, a pager, which are capable of alarming the user) has an alarm to notify a user upon receipt of transmitted signal (page, 3 par. 36-38) that do not expressly taught by Bertness. Besides, the combined references of Bertness and Tran do not expressly disclose external device and the battery separated from each other so as not to be physically coupled. Tsegn, on the other hand discloses a charger unit provides a pocket-sized communication device, which may be carried about the status of the charging process at a remote location, not to be physically coupled (col. 1, lines 58-67). Therfore the combination of these analogous arts provide applicat's invention as claimed. (see previous rejection and response to applicant's argument).